



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,706	06/13/2001	Paul A. Voois	8X8S.247PA	5532

7590 03/26/2004  
CRAWFORD PLLC  
Suite 390  
1270 Northland Drive  
St. Paul, MN 55120

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/880,706

Applicant(s)

VOOIS ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 1, 23, and 33 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
complete spelling for acronyms should be used the first time in each independent claim.  
For example, claim 1 line 3 "...having an OOP..." should be --... having and objected-oriented programming (OOP)...--. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Specification*

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Specification pages 1-2 under **Related Patent Documents**, please update, if available, any U.S. Patent number associated with the U.S. Patent Application Serial Number.  
  
Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neal et al. (U.S. Patent (6,263,064) in view of Kishinsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,286,033).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, 22, 33, 34, and 35 O'Neal et al. teach a computer implemented control center for routings communication services using telephony centric

Art Unit: 2642

network comprising: a call control (telephony server 126) to control the routing of calls via telephone network interface, for example, via a telephone; a device-control to provide telephony communication signals for the routed calls (network Interface 105); and a configuration manager ("computer implemented control center") to provide configuration information for the call control and the device control. O'Neal et al. do not teach having an object oriented programming (OOP) telephony interface and programmed.

Kishinsky et al. teach the object oriented programming used in the CTI call center environment to control call routings (col. 2, lines 56-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of OOP, as taught by Kishinsky, in O'Neal's system in order to have a better and more efficient and quick execution system.

Regarding claim 2, O'Neal et al. teach the configuration manager provides configuration information or a telephony device communicatively coupled to the routing arrangement (col. 4, lines 12-20).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Kishinsky et al. teach the JTAPI to interface with both local and remote applications (col. 9, lines 49-52).

Regarding claim 6, O'Neal et al. teach the phonelet is programmed with a selected access level to the routing arrangement (col. 7, lines 56-67).

Regarding claim 7, O'Neal et al. teach the call control application is adapted to route calls via an Internet protocol gateway (Fig. 1, 102).

Art Unit: 2642

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, O'Neal et al. teach the call control application adapted to communicate telephony device configuration selections between a user and the routing arrangement and via an Internet browser (col. 7, lines 39-67).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, O'Neal et al. do not teach the phone configuration application is adapted to monitor active calls and an administration call monitor to provide real time call monitoring. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that monitoring active calls would be necessary for routing calls.

Regarding claims 13 and 14 teach object defined by the OOPs supports range of objects allowed by a proprietary protocol (col. 7, lines 4-12). However, O'Neal et al. do not teach the device control application includes a media development kit adapted to convert between logical data and telephony data, at least one protocol handler communicatively coupled to the media development kit via a media device application protocol interface. It would have been obvious that different media development kit to support different of application and protocol that utilized by different system.

Regarding claim 15, O'Neal et al. teach the external hardware equipment includes an IP analog telephone interface (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 16, O'Neal et al. teach the device control application is adapted to provide telephony communication signals including DTMF tone (Fig. 1, user dialing a phone by inputting DTMF tone).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, O'Neal et al. teach the configuration manager is adapted to edit the configuration information in response to a user request and permit

Art Unit: 2642

user editing based upon an access code provided by the user based upon the security level associated with the user access code (col. 8, lines 17-30).

Regarding claims 19-21, Kishinsky et al. teach any type of object oriented script may be expressed as a form of XML for transportation over a DPN reads on claimed the configuration manager is adapted to store configuration data in the form of enterprise java beans.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, O'Neal et al. teach a plurality of communications stations communicatively coupled to each other (Figure 1).

Regarding claims 24 and 25, O'Neal et al. teach at least one of the plurality of communications stations includes a user interface / a computer (Fig. 1, 100).

Regarding claims 26 and 27, Kishinsky et al. teach a combination of internal OOP program instructions and OOP program instructions received from an external source wherein OOP program instructions are provided by a user at one of the plurality of communications stations (7-21).

Regarding claims 28 and 41, O'Neal et al. teach sending telephony data includes sending voice data, for example, voice call or voice files.

Regarding claims 29 and 42, O'Neal et al. teach routing telephony data via a PSTN (col. 6, lines 17-20).

Claims 30, 31, 43 and 44 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 18. However, O'Neal et al. do not teach determining a relationship between a call source and destination having a pre-selected telephony rate application

Art Unit: 2642

and applying the rate to the communication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made the feature above-mentioned in O'Neal's system in order to assist the routing process.

Regarding claim 32, O'Neal et al. teach the communications stations are communicatively coupled via a T1 link (39-48).

Regarding claim 36, O'Neal et al. teach providing a router adapted to be used at a telephone service provider for controlling telephone calls to a plurality of subscribers (col. 7, lines 30-32).

Regarding claim 37, O'Neal et al. teach router 106 acts cooperatively with hub 108 to permit properly addressed data packets to be received through firewall 112 reads on claimed "assigning a telephone number to a selected IP telephony address".

Regarding claim 38, O'Neal et al. teach providing call control configuration information for controlling call forwarding, voicemail (col. 11, line 50 through col. 12, line 3).

Regarding claims 39 and 40, O'Neal et al. do not teach prompting a user for an input and wherein providing configuration information includes providing information in response to the prompt. The advantage of prompting the user for an input and responding to the prompt is well known, for example, prompting the user and allow him or her to select the desire alternate destination for routing a telephone call.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-

Art Unit: 2642


5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen  
March 18, 2004

  
**AHMAD F. MATAR**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700